

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 30, 2005, has been carefully considered. Claim 9 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 16 has been amended to provide a description of the cooperation of the lever arm with the contacting member.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 112

The examiner has rejected Claims 16 under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite, and Claims 17-20 as depending from an indefinite claim. Claim 16 has been amended to describe the cooperation of a lever arm with a contacting member. The Applicant believes that the amended Claim 16 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 and advance Claim 16 toward allowance.

Because the rejections of Claims 17-20 were due to the dependence on Claim 16, and because the Applicant believes that Claim 16 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 17-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claim 17-20 and advance Claims 17-20 toward allowance.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 103

The examiner has rejected Claims 5, 7, 8 and 10-20 under 35 USC § 103 as anticipated by Warrick (US 5,857,247 in view of Hollins (US 3,255,502). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 5. Claim 5 includes limitations that:

a lever arm having a lever arm actuating end and a pivot end, wherein the lever arm pivot end is pivotally coupled to the actuating member;

and

motion of the lever arm actuating end in a first direction is directly coupled to the actuating member through contact of the lever arm with the contacting end of the actuating member, whereby the actuating member is movable from said first position to said second position;

and

motion of the lever arm actuating end in a second direction is inversely coupled to the actuating member through the lever arm pivot end, wherein the lever arm contacts and pivots about the contacting member, whereby the actuating member is movable from said first position to said second position.

Thus, Claim 5 described a lever arm with an actuating end, wherein a motion of the actuating end in a first direction releases the buckle, and motion of the actuating end in a second direction also releases the buckle. Further, motion of the lever arm actuating end in the first direction is directly coupled to the actuating member, and motion of the lever arm in the second direction is inversely coupled to the actuating member by the pivoting of the lever arm about the contacting member.

The buckle of Hollis is released by lifting either of two opposite ends of the release member 64, not by a first motion or a second motion of the same end of the lever arm. Neither end of the release member 64 of Hollins can moved in two directions from the latched position. Further, lifting either end of the release member 64 of Hollins is directly coupled to the actuating part 58 by the pin 62. Thus, neither Warrick nor Hollins describe a lever arm actuating end which may be moved in two directions, and neither Warrick nor Hollins describe direct coupling of a lever arm for releasing the buckle as a result of moving a lever arm in the first direction, and inverse coupling of a lever arm for releasing the buckle as a result of moving a lever arm in a second direction and the pivoting of the lever arm about the contacting member. Further, neither Warrick nor Hollins describe a contacting member or the cooperation of a lever arm with a contracting member. Because the Applicant believes that neither Warrick nor Hollins describe all of the limitations included in the original Claim 5, the

applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 5 and advance Claim 5 toward allowance.

Because Claims 7, 8 and 10-15 depend from Claim 5, and because the Applicant believes that Claim 5 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 7, 8 and 10-15 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claim 7, 8 and 10-15 and advance Claims 7, 8 and 10-15 toward allowance.

Because Claims 6 and 9 depend from Claim 5, and because the Applicant believes that Claim 5 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 6 and 9 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claim 6 and 9 and advance Claims 6 and 9 toward allowance.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 16, as in the instance of Claim 5, the amended Claim 16 includes a lever arm with an actuating end, wherein a motion of the actuating end in a first direction releases the buckle, and motion of the actuating end in a second direction also releases the buckle. Further, motion of the lever arm actuating end in the first direction is directly coupled to the actuating member, and motion of the lever arm in the second direction is inversely coupled to the actuating member by the pivoting of the lever arm about the contacting member

The buckle of Hollis is released by lifting either of two ends of the release member 64, not by a first motion or a second motion of the same end of the lever arm. Neither end of the release member 64 of Hollins can moved in two directions from the latched position. Further, lifting either end of the release member 64 of Hollins is directly coupled to the actuating part 58 by the pin 62. Thus, neither Warrick nor Hollins describe a lever arm actuating end which may be moved in two directions, and

neither Warrick nor Hollins describe direct coupling of a lever arm for releasing the buckle as a result of moving a lever arm in the first direction, and inverse coupling of a lever arm for releasing the buckle as a result of moving a lever arm in a second direction and the pivoting of the lever arm about the contacting member. Further, neither Warrick nor Hollins describe a contacting member or the cooperation of a lever arm with a contracting member. Because the Applicant believes that neither Warrick nor Hollins describe all of the limitations included in the herein amended Claim 16, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 and advance Claim 16 toward allowance.

Because Claims 17-20 depend from Claim 16, and because the Applicant believes that Claim 16 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 17-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claim 17-20 and advance Claims 17-20 toward allowance.

In summary, the Office Action proposed that because of the benefit of a dual action release, it would have been obvious to modify the release buckle of Warrick as suggested by the structure of Hollis. Applicant respectfully suggests that identifying a benefit does not amount to describing a lever arm actuating end which may be moved in a first direction or in a second direction to release a buckle, which lever arm actuating end motions are not the identical motions (lifting) of opposite ends of the lever 64 of Hollis. Neither Warrick nor Hollins describe a contacting member cooperating with a lever arm to inversely couple the lever arm to an actuating lever. Further, the two motions of the lever arm actuating end are coupled to the actuating lever through different structure, whereas lifting either end of the lever 64 of Hollis identically and directly result in lifting the pin 62 of Hollis.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. The rejection of Claim 5 has been respectfully traversed, and Claim 16 has been amended to overcome the rejections in the Office Action mailed June 30, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1-20 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth L. Green

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn
8244 Painter Avenue
Whittier, CA 90602
(562) 698-8039